



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/879,694	06/12/2001	Ulises J. Cicciarelli	RSW920000177US1	3794

7590 06/16/2004

IBM Corporation  
T81/062  
PO Box 12195  
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER
----------

GORDON, CARLENE MICHELLE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2124

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2004

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/879,694

Applicant(s)

CICCIARELLI ET AL.

Examiner

Carlene Gordon

Art Unit

2124

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3, 18, 19, 27 and 30 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2, 06/12/01.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to the application filed June 12, 2001.

Claims 1-33 have been submitted for examination.

### ***Drawings***

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description:

- a. Each figure is not listed separately in the Brief Description of the Drawings.

- b. Figure 10B, reference 1065 is not mentioned in the description.

A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show the selection of a particular software suite to be customized as described in the specification (pg. 32, lines 10-11).

Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid

Art Unit: 2124

abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description:

- a. Reference 745 (pg. 33, line 12) is missing from Fig. 7.
- b. Reference 1085 (pg. 41, line 11) is missing from Fig. 10B.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

5. The drawings are objected to because the reference sign numbers of Figure 7 do not match with the details described in the description.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

6. The Office gives notice to the applicant to make all other appropriate corrections to the drawings and amendments to the specifications to include the appropriate reference signs. No new material may be added.

***Specification***

7. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The “mode” (pg. 8, line 11) is misspelled. The Office interprets the word “mode” to be spelled as “model” for consistency with the description. If the word is intended to be “mode”, there exists a lack of antecedent basis.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Objections***

8. Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities:

The “mode” (line 2) is misspelled. Office interprets the word “mode” to be spelled as “model” for consistency with the description. If the word is intended to be “mode”, the Office will reject the claim, reasons being for the lack of antecedent basis.

Appropriate correction is required.

9. Claim 30 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

Claim 30 recites only the limitations of claim 29; therefore, claim 30 does not further limit claim 29.

10. Claim 27 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 27 is missing period at the end of the claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

11. Claims 18 and 19 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 18 and 19 refer to the systems of a previous method claim.

Claims 18 and 19 recite the same limitations of claims 7 and 9, respectively.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

12. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

13. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The language of claims raises a question as to whether the claims are directed merely to an abstract idea that is not tied to a technological art, environment, or machine which would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject

matter under 35 U.S.C. 101. The Office interprets the invention of the claims as an abstract idea.

14. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The language of claims raises a question as to whether the claims are directed merely to an abstract idea that is not tied to a technological art, environment, or machine which would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101. The language of claim 2 teaches the use of conditional information to determine if the installation should be performed, but it leaves open the possibility installation should not be performed which would render the claim as an abstract idea as interpreted by the Office.

15. To expedite a complete examination of the instant application the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 (nonstatutory) above are further rejected as set forth below in anticipation of applicant amending these claims to place them within the four statutory categories of invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

16. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2124

17. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 4 contains the trademark/trade name Java Bean. Where a trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. See *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the goods themselves. Thus, a trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the trademark or trade name. In the present case, the trademark/trade name is used to identify/describe instantiated objects and, accordingly, the identification/description is indefinite.

18. Claims 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is not clear what is meant by which components when the applicant refers to the "software component-level conditional installation components" and the "suite-level conditional installation components. The use of the term component renders the claims indefinite.



***Double Patenting***

19. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

20. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No. 09/930,325, hereinafter '325. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because instant claim 1 is anticipated by '325 claim 1.

As per instant claim 1, "325 claim 1 also recites a method for improving installation of software packages comprising steps of:

defining an object model representing a plurality of components of a software installation process,

populating the object model to describe a particular software installation package,

Claim 1 of '325 does not read the exact terms used in instant claim 1. However,

Art Unit: 2124

the Office interprets instant claim 1 limitation: "wherein the defined model enables specifying conditional installation information for the components" to be an obvious variation over '325 claim 1 limitation: "defining one or more rules for execution by a rules engine, wherein each rule specifies one or more conditions and at least one action to be taken when the specified conditions are matched during the execution by the rules engine, and wherein the specified conditions pertain to a target run-time environment and the at least one action may be used to select from among the topologies." Here, conditional installation information is being specified.

The Office also, interprets instant claim 1 limitation "populating the object model... wherein the conditional installation information is populated with information to describe conditional installation scenarios" to be an obvious variation over '325 claim 1 limitation: "populating the object model to describe a particular software installation package and one or more topologies for deployment of that particular software installation package." Here, the "one or more topologies for deployment" are interpreted to be the "conditional installation scenarios" of instant claim 1.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

21. Claims 3 and 4 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 2 and 3 of copending Application No. 09/930,325, hereafter '325 in view of **London Shrader et al.** (U.S. Patent No. **5,870,611**), hereafter "Shrader".

Claim 2 of '325 recites the exact limitations of instant claim 3, except claim 2 excludes the limitation as follows: each of the instantiated objects corresponding to a selected one of the components of the software installation process. Shrader teaches this limitation (col. 6, lines 19-22, "install plan and its components allow reuse... by creating instances...") and (col. 2, lines 19-22, "the objects... serve as components to build the plan object.").

Claim 3 of '325 recites the exact limitations of instant claim 4, the limitations as follows: the instantiated objects are JavaBeans.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

22. The Office makes notice that other pending applications by the same applicant(s) and/or assignee contain similar claims and are not patentably distinct. The Office asks that all other pending applications containing similar claims be made to be patentably distinct.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

23. Claims 1, 3, 12-14, 16-17, 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **London Shrader et al.** (U.S. Patent No. **5,870,611**), hereafter "Shrader", and further in view of **Luu** (U.S. Patent No. **5,860,012**), hereafter "Luu".

24. As to claim 1, Shrader teaches:

defining an object model representing a plurality of components of a software installation process (col. 1, lines 17-22, "defining... plan object for installing... software), (col. 2, lines 13-22, "components to build the plan object"), populating the object model to describe a particular software installation package (col. 2, lines 47-58, "populate an install plan object"),

Shrader does not explicitly disclose wherein the defined model enables specifying conditional installation information for the components or wherein the conditional installation information is populated with information to describe conditional installation scenarios. Shrader does disclose an application object that represents an application to be installed and serves as a component to build the installation plan object (col. 2, lines 19-22, and lines 47-53). However, Luu discloses that the installation procedures for an application, which are provided by the particular software application, allow for various application installation scenarios (col. 5, lines 60-67) (Examiner interprets Luu's disclosure to encompass enabling the specification of conditional installation information and conditional installation scenarios).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the invention to have included within the application object of Shrader the installation procedures of Luu for the application that describe various installation scenarios because Luu teaches that these installation procedures are not standardized which gives a user more options of installation and Luu's invention further allows for remote installation of application software.

25. As to claim 3, Shrader further teaches The method according to Claim 1, further comprising the step of instantiating a plurality of objects according to the defined object mode, each of the instantiated objects corresponding to a selected one of the components of the software installation process (col. 6, lines 19-22, "install plan and its components allow reuse... by creating instances...") and (col. 2, lines 19-22, "the objects... serve as components to build the plan object."), and wherein the populating step populates the instantiated objects (col. 5, lines 60-66, "Each object has certain attributes... which operate on the data.") (Examiner interprets this to imply that an Administrator has already performed populating an object, which relates to a component of the instant invention,).

26. As to claim 12, Shrader further discloses caching one or more of the plurality of instantiated objects (col. 4, lines 15-18, RAM is the memory into which application programs are loaded. It was a well-known practice in the art at the time of the invention to cache the frequently accessed Ram locations. Furthermore, as defined by Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary, 3<sup>rd</sup> Editions, caching is faster than RAM accesses.)

27. As to claim 13, rejection of claim 12 is incorporated and further claim 13 recites limitations as recited in claim 12, therefore, claim 13 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 12. Furthermore, avoiding downloading is an inherent use of cache.

28. As to claim 14, rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further claim 14 recites limitations as recited in claim 1, therefore, claim 14 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1. Furthermore, Shrader discloses the system for improving installation of software packages (Figure 1).

29. As to claim 16, rejection of claims 3 and 14 are incorporated and further claim 16 recites limitations as recited in claims 3 and 14, therefore, claim 16 is rejected under the same rationale as claims 3 and 14.

30. As to claim 17, Shrader further discloses wherein the instantiated objects are objects in a scripting language (col. 9, lines 19-20 and 45-50, "Plan objects initiate generating install scripts." "install script files contain commands and order in which applications should be installed").

31. As to claim 22, rejection of claims 12 and 16 are incorporated and further claim 22 recites limitations as recited in claims 12 and 16, therefore, claim 22 is rejected under the same rationale as claims 12 and 16.

32. As to claim 23, rejection of claims 13 and 22 are incorporated and further claim 23 recites limitations as recited in claims 13 and 22, therefore, claim 23 is rejected under the same rationale as claims 13 and 22.

33. As to claim 24, rejection of claims 1 is incorporated and further claim 24 recites limitations as recited in claim 1, therefore, claim 24 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1. Furthermore, Shrader discloses the computer program product for improving installation of software packages comprising computer-readable program code (col. 4, lines 36-48, Shrader teaches instructions stored on medium that carries computer readable information.)

34. Claims 2, 5-11, 15, 18-21 25-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shrader and Luu as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of **Zimniewicz et al.** (U.S. Patent No. **6,744,450**), hereafter "Zimniewicz".

35. As to claim 2, Luu does not explicitly teach using the conditional installation information of the populated object model during an installation of the particular software installation package to determine whether the installation should be performed; and performing the installation if so. Luu does teach the installation procedures are not standardized but allow for various application installation scenarios (col. 5, lines 60-67). However, Zimniewicz teaches the components contained in its software package

Art Unit: 2124

providing information on its suite baseline requirements (col. 8, lines 33-35). This information is used to determine whether installation should be performed (col. 8, lines 33-52, "suite baseline has not been met") and performing the installation if so ("user chooses not to install"). Further Zimniewicz teaches other conditional installation scenarios.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include in the various application installation scenarios of Luu one that uses information provided with the installation components of Zimniewicz to determine whether installation should be performed because it is commonly known in the art to give the option of performing or not performing the installation in order to give the user more options and maximum flexibility of the install actions.

36. As to claim 5, Zimniewicz further teaches wherein the conditional installation information comprises a suite-level conditional installation component (Abstract) (The user can choose to install a suite of applications containing components).

25. As to claim 6, Zimniewicz further teaches wherein the conditional installation information comprises one or more software component-level conditional installation components (col. 7, lines 22-34, "install only selected... components from the suite").

37. As to claim 7, Zimniewicz further teaches wherein the conditional installation information comprises a suite-level conditional installation component and one or more



software component-level conditional installation components (Abstract, "install a suite of applications"), (col. 7, lines 22-34, "install only selected... components from the suite").

38. As to claim 8, Zimniewicz further teaches a step of evaluating the suite-level conditional installation component and/or the one or more software component-level conditional installation components as preconditions to installing a corresponding one of the components of the particular software installation package (col. 8, lines 33-40, Zimniewicz discloses suite baseline requirements being met, or evaluated, for a component, and a user choosing to install based on these requirements being met.).

39. As to claim 9, Zimniewicz further teaches a step of evaluating the suite-level conditional installation component and/or the one or more software component-level conditional installation components as preconditions to downloading and installing a corresponding one of the components of the particular software installation package (col. 8, lines 33-40, Zimniewicz discloses suite baseline requirements being met, or evaluated, for a component, and a user choosing to install based on these requirements being met.), (col. 6, lines 50-60, "install components that have previously been downloaded").

40. As to claim 10, Zimniewicz further teaches wherein the conditional installation information comprises an executable code module (col. 4, lines 51-56, "computer-executable instructions, such as program modules...").

41. As to claim 11, Zimniewicz further teaches wherein the conditional installation information comprises a reference to an executable code module (col. 4, lines 51-56, "computer-executable instructions, such as program modules...").

42. As to claim 15, rejection of claims 2 and 14 are incorporated and further claim 15 recites limitations as recited in claims 2 and 14, therefore, claim 15 is rejected under the same rationale as claims 2 and 14.

43. As to claim 18, rejection of claim 7 is incorporated and further claim 18 recites limitations as recited in claim 7, therefore, claim 18 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 7.

44. As to claim 19, rejection of claim 9 is incorporated and further claim 19 recites limitations as recited in claim 9, therefore, claim 19 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 9.

Art Unit: 2124

45. As to claim 20, rejection of claims 10 and 14 are incorporated and further claim 20 recites limitations as recited in claims 10 and 14, therefore, claim 20 is rejected under the same rationale as claims 10 and 14.

46. As to claim 21, rejection of claims 11 and 14 are incorporated and further claim 21 recites limitations as recited in claims 11 and 14, therefore, claim 21 is rejected under the same rationale as claims 11 and 14.

47. As to claim 25, rejection of claims 2 and 24 are incorporated and further claim 25 recites limitations as recited in claims 2 and 24, therefore, claim 25 is rejected under the same rationale as claims 2 and 24.

48. As to claim 26, rejection of claims 3 and 25 are incorporated and further claim 26 recites limitations as recited in claims 3 and 25, therefore, claim 26 is rejected under the same rationale as claims 3 and 25.

49. As to claim 27, Shrader further teaches the instantiated objects are structured documents (col. 5, lines 60-67). (The use of structured documents here is synonymous with using object oriented programming to create the documents, in which Shrader teaches.)

50. As to claim 28, rejection of claims 7 and 24 are incorporated and further claim 28 recites limitations as recited in claims 7 and 24, therefore, claim 28 is rejected under the same rationale as claims 7 and 24.

51. As to claim 29, rejection of claims 8 and 28 are incorporated and further claim 29 recites limitations as recited in claims 8 and 28, therefore, claim 29 is rejected under the same rationale as claims 8 and 28.

52. As to claim 30, rejection of claim 29 is incorporated and further claim 30 recites limitations as recited in claim 29, therefore, claim 30 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 29.

53. As to claim 31, rejection of claims 10 and 24 are incorporated and further claim 31 recites limitations as recited in claims 10 and 24, therefore, claim 31 is rejected under the same rationale as claims 10 and 24.

54. As to claim 32, rejection of claims 12 and 26 are incorporated and further claim 32 recites limitations as recited in claims 12 and 26, therefore, claim 32 is rejected under the same rationale as claims 12 and 26. Furthermore, one skilled in the art would have been motivated to cache one or more of the plurality of components, as opposed to objects, instead of using just RAM.

55. As to claim 33, rejection of claims 13 and 32 are incorporated and further claim 33 recites limitations as recited in claims 13 and 32, therefore, claim 33 is rejected under the same rationale as claims 13 and 32.

56. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shrader and Luu as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of **Hammond** (U.S. Patent No. **6,637,020**).

57. As to claim 4, Shrader and Luu fail to disclose that the instantiated objects are JavaBeans. However, Hammond discloses the use of Java Beans as component models (col. 4, lines 49-63). It was well known in the art at the time of the invention that a Java Bean is a reusable application component that can be combined with other Java Bean components to create a Java applet or application. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to use JavaBeans as the instantiated objects of Shrader because the Java Bean concept emphasizes the platform-independence of the Java language, in which ideally a program, once written can run on any computing platform.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Shrader et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,867,713) teaches an install plan object.
- b. Delo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,370,686) teaches a method for installing selected components.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carlene Gordon whose telephone number is (703) 605-4226. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (703) 305-9662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

C.G. / C.D.

  
**ANIL KHATRI**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**